

### **REMARKS**

In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

#### **Interview Summary**

Applicant and Applicants' representative thank Examiner Krasnic for his time and consideration in participating in an interview on May 19, 2009.

With regard to the finality of the outstanding Office Action, Examiner Krasnic agreed that the finality of the Office Action is premature because the rejection of claims 7-11 under 35 USC § 101 is a new rejection that is (1) not necessitated by any claim amendments presented by Applicant, and (2) not based on any information presented in an Information Disclosure Statement. Examiner Krasnic stated that the finality of the outstanding Office Action would be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of claims 7-11 under 35 USC § 101, the Examiner suggested amending the claims to tie the significant steps of the method claims to another statutory device.

In the May 4, 2009 Amendment, claim 7 has been amended to recite a compression method displaying step for displaying on a display for each region one or more compression methods for the compression process to be performed in accordance with a type of the region from among a plurality of compression methods. Claims 8-11 were amended similarly. Without conceding to the Examiner's position that the displaying step is not a significant step in claims 7-11, Applicant further amends claim 7 to recite a region extraction step of separating and extracting by a regional extracting component or processor, a character region, a

graphic region and a photograph region from image data; a region compression step of performing by a compressing component or processor, compression a compression process for image data in each region extracted by said region extraction step; and said region compression step performing by the compressing component or processor, the compression process for the image data of each region using the compression method selected for the region data by said compression method selection step. The subject matter in claim 7 is tied to another statutory category, e.g., a regional extracting component or processor, and a compressing component or processor. Claims 8-11 have been amended similarly.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7-11 under 35 USC § 101 be withdrawn.

During the interview, the Examiner and the Applicant's representative also discussed the rejection of claims 1 – 16 and 40 under 35 USC § 103(a) on the basis of US Patent 5,949,968, (hereinafter, "Gentile") in view of the article "Mixed Raster Content...", (hereinafter, "Queiroz"), JP 05-110737, (hereinafter "Hiroshi"), and US Patent Publication 2003/0132960, (hereinafter "Litwiller").

The Examiner and Applicant's representative discussed all four cited references. Applicant's representative maintained all arguments traversing the obviousness rejection, submitted in the May 4, 2009 Amendment. In addition, Applicant's representative emphasized that Gentile, Queiroz and Hiroshi do not teach or suggest a selection unit which displays one or more compression methods on the display for user's selection. In particular, the consultant 166 which selects compression algorithm, as disclosed in Gentile, is a computer-based function, and is not based on user's selection.

Applicant's representative further emphasized that Litwiller only discloses displaying possible compression parameter choices for the entire message. Therefore, Gentile, Queiroz and Hiroshi and Litwiller, whether considered individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the combination of claim 1 that includes a selection unit which displays one or more compression methods on the display for each region.

The Examiner indicated that further detailed review of the cited references is needed, and agreed to consider the arguments submitted in the May 4, 2009 Amendment and the arguments made during the interview.

**Conclusion**

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections. In the event that there are any questions concerning the amendments, or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 22, 2009

By: Weiwei Y. Stilther  
Weiwei Y. Stilther  
Registration No. 62,979

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620